

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 3-9 are now in the application. Claims 3-9 are subject to examination.

Claims 4-6, 8 and 9 have been amended. Claim 2 has been canceled to facilitate prosecution of the instant application.

Under the heading "Allowable Subject Matter" on page 7 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claim 3 is allowed.

Claim 2 has been canceled and all of the dependent claims have been amended to depend from allowed claim 3.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,360,586 to Flanders et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,715,039 to Fukuda et al. and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0118456 A1 to Hasman et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claim 2 has been canceled and all of the dependent claims have been amended to depend from allowed claim 3.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 4 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 5 has been rejected as being obvious over U.S.

Patent No. 4,360,586 to Flanders et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,715,039 to Fukuda et al. and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0118456 A1 to Hasman et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,467,166 to Shiraishi under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

All of the dependent claims have been amended to depend from allowed claim 3.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 5 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 7 has been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,360,586 to Flanders et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,715,039 to Fukuda et al. and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0118456 A1 to Hasman et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,309,809 B1 to Starikov et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

All of the dependent claims have been amended to depend from allowed claim 3.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 6 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 9 has been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,360,586 to Flanders et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,715,039 to Fukuda et al. and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0118456 A1 to Hasman et al. and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0157086 A1 to Hwang et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

All of the dependent claims have been amended to depend from allowed claim 3.

Claim 3 has been allowed. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 3.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 4-9 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out, and so that a prompt notice of allowance can be issued.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP, No. 12-1099.

Appl. No. 10/540,754
Reply to Office Action of June 29, 2009
Amdt. Dated September 15, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Weichselbaum/
Mark P. Weichselbaum
(Reg. No. 43,248)

MPW:cgm

September 15, 2009

Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101